REMARKS

This paper accompanies the filing of a request for continued prosecution (RCE) and is presented in response to the final official action of February 26, 2009, wherein (a) claims 1-10 were pending, (b) claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, (c) claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Avant U.S. 6,676,621 ("Avant") in view of Moed et al. U.S. 5,770,841 ("Moed"), and (d) claims 2 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Avant in view Moed and further in view of Didriksen WO 00/00300 ("Didriksen").

By the foregoing, claims 1-3, 6, 9, and 10 have been amended and claims 11-20 have been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1-3, 6, 9, and 10, and new claims 11-20 may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, support may be found at least in paragraphs [0024], [0025], [0029], [0032], [0034], [0040], [0044], [0050], [0053], [0057], [0063]-[0065], [0070], and [0073] of the specification as originally filed. No new matter is added. As a result, claims 1-20 are pending and at issue.

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is solicited.

35 USC § 101 Rejections

Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 1-8 is overcome by the amendment to claim 1 submitted herein. Claims 1-8 now positively recite the statutory class of machines. Additionally, claims 1-8 positively recite the subject matter being transformed (i.e., the mailpieces). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10 as obvious over Avant in view of Moed. Each of claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10 now recites a method (or device) for processing mailpieces comprising, in part, automatically selecting new address information from the address information in the database

when the stored detected address information does not match address information in the database. Avant and Moed fail to disclose or suggest automatically selecting new address information from the address information in the database when the stored detected address information does not match address information in the database. The claimed method and device advantageously provide a system that automatically corrects incorrect delivery address information (i.e., the sender of the mailpiece has incorrectly addressed the mailpiece). Avant and Moed do not contemplate the delivery address containing incorrect information (e.g., an old postal code). Rather, Avant and Moed only contemplate unreadable delivery address information.

Avant discloses a method for identifying a mailpiece in an identification code sorting system by using an identification code as a redundant source of delivery information. The identification code is linked to an identification file containing identification information corresponding to the mailpiece. The mailpiece generally contains two sources of delivery information, a destination address and a POSTNET code corresponding to the destination address. If the destination address is illegible, the POSTNET code provides an alternative source of delivery information. However, Avant fails to disclose or suggest any method for correcting incorrect delivery address information on a mailpiece. Moreover, Avant fails to disclose or suggest automatically selecting new address information from address information in a database when stored detected address information does not match address information in the database, as recited by each of claims 1, 3, and 8-10. Rather, Avant simply discloses using redundant codes on a mailpiece in case one of the codes is unreadable.

Moed discloses a system and method for reading package information. Moed discloses reading a package label including at least a destination address and a machine-readable symbol bearing a package identification number. See Moed, col. 2, lines 32-38. An image of the package is taken and the destination address is validated by checking a database. If the address is invalid, an image of the package is displayed on a workstation and an operator manually enters the correct destination address. See Moed, col. 2, lines 40-44. Moed repeatedly teaches that the operator

manually enters the data. See, e.g., Moed, col. 3, lines 1-2; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 5; col. 9, lines 34-37; col. 10, lines 20-21; col. 10, lines 55-56; col. 14, lines 4-5; col. 14, lines 23-25; col. 14, lines 55-56; and col. 15, lines 10-11. Moed teaches that the operator must manually view the image of the package and manually enter new address data because there may be problems with the Optical Character Recognition (OCR) software (i.e., the OCR software was unable to resolve a character on the package label). Moed never contemplates the problem of incorrect, but OCR readable, data on the package label.

Because Avant and Moed fail to disclose or suggest automatically selecting new address information from address information in a database when stored detected address information does not match address information in the database, none of claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10 can be rendered obvious by any combination of Avant and Moed. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2 and 7 as obvious over Avant in view of Moed and further in view of Didriksen. Like claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10, each of claims 2 and 7 recites a method (or device) for processing mailpieces comprising, in part, automatically selecting new address information from the address information in the database when the stored detected address information does not match address information in the database. As shown above, Avant and Moed fail to disclose or suggest automatically selecting new address information from the address information in the database when the stored detected address information does not match address information in the database. Likewise, Didriksen fails to disclose or suggest automatically selecting new address information from the address information in the database when the stored detected address information does not match address information in the database, nor was Didriksen cited as disclosing such an element.

Because Avant, Moed, and Didriksen fail to disclose or suggest automatically selecting new address information from the address information in the database when the stored detected address information does not match address

information in the database, none of claims 2 and 7 can be rendered obvious by any combination of Avant, Moed, and Didriksen. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 7.

New Claims 13-20

New claims 13-20 are allowable over any combination of Avant, Moed, and Didriksen at least for the reasons set forth above.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the cited art does not show each and every element of the pending claims, as required to support an anticipation and/or obviousness rejection. Therefore, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn and the present claims passed to issue. Such action is solicited.

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application toward allowance, the examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned agent at the indicated number.

May 1, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Michael A. Chinlund, Reg. No. 55,064
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Agent for Applicant